



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/876,557	06/07/2001	Takeshi Asano	YOR9-2000-0206US2 (8728-3)	8167

7590 06/10/2003  
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLP  
Suite 501  
1900 Hempstead Turnpike  
East Meadow, NY 11554

EXAMINER

WIMER, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2821

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/876,557

Applicant(s)

ASANO ET AL.

Examiner

Michael C. Wimer

Art Unit

2821

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.


NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.  
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 1,3-10 and 12-14.Claim(s) objected to: none.Claim(s) rejected: 19-26.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 15-18.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Michael C. Wimer  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 2821

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Snowdon does provide a conductive RF shielding foil 15 with the radiating slot formed therein, along with the feed connected across the slot. Snowdon teaches a 70mm X 30 mm copper foil which defines a shield. The conductive foil 15 shields anything in its path. The claims rejected here do not make any reference to components, elements or structure relevant to the antenna or electronic display which need to be "shielded". Any metal foil is deemed a shield because it prevents any EM fields, not operating through the feed-slot, to be shielded from any other structure. Therefore, Claim 19 does not preclude the use of the structure of Snowdon in an anticipation rejection. Applicant has emphasized the language "a feed portion extending partially across the hole", forming the slot antenna (or notch as in Claim 23), in the Response filed 5/30/2003. However, this phrase in Claim 19 (and a variation in Claim 23) merely describes a conventional coaxial feeder across a slot, where the central lead connects to an edge of the slot and the shield connects to a side of the slot opposite the central feed connection. Applicant's summary sets forth this language on page 13, third paragraph and the fourth paragraph sets forth the feed connection of the feed cable and slot radiator, and the fifth paragraph describes how impedance matching is achieved in slot antennas. The claims may contain certain language that applicant deems to be absent from the prior art. However, this language is considered to mean what is shown in the prior art. For example, the ground shield of the coax does not project into the slot or notch. The shield/braid of the coax is connected opposite a point on the slot in which the center lead connects. The coax feed point is attached along the slot/notch which provides the proper impedance match. Therefore, it is not seen how these rejected claims patentably define over the prior art of record.